



Data Declaration

Table 1—Crime in the United States by Volume and Rate per 100,000 Inhabitants, 1987-2006

Table 1A—Crime in the United States, Percent Change in Volume and Rate per 100,000 Inhabitants for 2 years, 5 years, and 10 years

The FBI collects these data through the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program.

General comments

- These tables provide the estimated number and rate (per 100,000 inhabitants) of reported crimes in the United States for 1987 through 2006, as well as the 2-, 5-, and 10-year trends for 2006 based on these estimates.
- The UCR Program does not have sufficient data to estimate arson offenses.

Methodology

- The data used in creating this table were from all law enforcement agencies participating in the UCR Program (including those submitting less than 12 months of data).
- Crime statistics for the Nation include estimated offense totals (except arson) for agencies submitting less than 12 months of offense reports for each year.
- The 2006 statistics in this table are consistent with those published in Table 2.
- Prior to the release of this publication, the FBI reestimated the state offense totals published in the previous edition of *Crime in the United States* to reflect more current data. Because of this, the national totals for 2005 may have been adjusted.

Offense estimation

These tables contain statistics for the entire United States. Because not all law enforcement agencies provide data for complete reporting periods, the FBI includes estimated crime numbers in these presentations. The FBI estimates data for three areas:

Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), cities outside MSAs, and nonmetropolitan counties. The FBI computes estimates by using the known crime figures of similar areas within a state and assigning the same proportion of crime volumes to nonreporting agencies or agencies with missing data. The estimation process considers the following: population size covered by the agency; type of jurisdiction, e.g., police department versus sheriff's office; and geographic location.

In response to various circumstances, the FBI calculates estimated offense totals for certain states. For example, some states do not provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. In addition, problems at the state level have, at times, resulted in no usable data. Also, the conversion of the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) data to Summary data has contributed to the need for unique estimation procedures. A summary of state-specific and offense-specific estimation procedures follows.

| Year | State(s) | Reason for Estimation | Estimation Method |
|------|----------------------|--|---|
| 1987 | Illinois | The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | The rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and assigning the forcible rape volumes proportionally to the state. |
| 1988 | Illinois | The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | The rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and assigning the forcible rape volumes proportionally to the state. |
| | Florida, Kentucky | Reporting problems at the state level resulted in no usable | State totals were estimated by updating previous valid annual |

| | | | |
|------|----------|--|---|
| | | data. | totals for individual jurisdictions, subdivided by population group. Percent changes for each offense within each population group of the geographic divisions in which the states reside were applied to the previous valid annual totals. The state totals were compiled from the sums of the population group estimates. |
| 1989 | Illinois | The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | The rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and assigning the forcible rape volumes proportionally to the state. |
| 1990 | Illinois | The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | The rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and assigning the forcible rape volumes proportionally to the state. |
| 1991 | Illinois | The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | The rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and assigning the forcible rape volumes proportionally to the state. |
| | Iowa | NIBRS conversion efforts resulted in estimation for | State totals were estimated by updating previous valid annual |

| | | | |
|------|----------|--|---|
| | | Iowa. | totals for individual jurisdictions, subdivided by population group. Percent changes for each offense within each population group of the West North Central Division were applied to the previous valid annual totals. The state totals were compiled from the sums of the population group estimates. |
| 1992 | Illinois | The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | The rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and assigning the forcible rape volumes proportionally to the state. |
| 1993 | Illinois | <p>NIBRS conversion efforts resulted in estimation for Illinois.</p> <p>The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.</p> | <p>Since valid annual totals were available for approximately 60 Illinois agencies, those counts were maintained. The counts for the remaining jurisdictions were replaced with the most recent valid annual totals or were generated using standard estimation procedures. The results of all sources were then combined to arrive at the 1993 state total for Illinois.</p> <p>The rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and assigning</p> |

| | | | |
|------|---------------------|--|---|
| | | | the forcible rape volumes proportionally to the state. |
| | Kansas | NIBRS conversion efforts resulted in estimation for Kansas. | State totals were estimated by updating previous valid annual totals for individual jurisdictions, subdivided by population group. Percent changes for each offense within each population group of the West North Central Division were applied to the previous valid annual totals. The state totals were compiled from the sums of the population group estimates. |
| | Michigan, Minnesota | The state UCR Programs were unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | The rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and assigning the forcible rape volumes proportionally to each state. |
| 1994 | Illinois | <p>NIBRS conversion efforts resulted in estimation for Illinois.</p> <p>The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with</p> | <p>Illinois totals were generated using only the valid crime rates for the East North Central Division. Within each population group, the state's offense totals were estimated based on the rate per 100,000 inhabitants within the remainder of the division.</p> <p>The rape totals were estimated using national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight</p> |

| | | | |
|------|----------|--|---|
| | | UCR guidelines. | population groups and assigning the forcible rape volumes proportionally to the state. |
| | Kansas | NIBRS conversion efforts resulted in estimation for Kansas. | State totals were generated using only the valid crimes rates for the West North Central Division. Within each population group, the state's offense totals were estimated based on the rate per 100,000 inhabitants within the remainder of the division. |
| | Montana | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete 1994 offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | State totals were estimated by updating previous valid annual totals for individual jurisdictions, subdivided by population group. Percent changes for each offense within each population group of the Mountain Division were applied to the previous valid annual totals. The state totals were compiled from the sums of the population group estimates. |
| 1995 | Kansas | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | The state UCR Program was able to provide valid 1994 state totals which were then updated using 1995 crime trends for the West North Central Division. |
| | Illinois | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance | Valid Crime Index (Part I) counts were available for most of the largest cities (100,000 and over in |

| | | | |
|------|---------|---|--|
| | | with UCR guidelines. | population). For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were state totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary data. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. |
| | Montana | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | State estimates were computed by updating the previous valid annual totals using the 1994 versus 1995 percent changes for the Mountain Division. |
| 1996 | Florida | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete | The state UCR Program was able to provide an aggregated state total; |

| | | | |
|--|----------|---|---|
| | | offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | data received from 94 individual Florida agencies are shown in the 1996 jurisdictional figures presented in Tables 8 through 11. |
| | Illinois | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | Valid Crime Index (Part I) counts were available for most of the largest cities (100,000 and over in population). For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were state totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. |

| | | | |
|------|-------------------|---|---|
| | Kansas | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | The Kansas state estimate was extrapolated from 1996 January-June state totals provided by the Kansas State UCR Program. |
| | Kentucky, Montana | The state UCR Programs were unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | The 1995 and 1996 percent changes within each geographic division were applied to valid 1995 state totals to generate 1996 state totals. |
| 1997 | Illinois | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | Valid Crime Index (Part I) counts were available for most of the largest cities (100,000 and over in population). For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were state totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by |

| | | | |
|------|--|---|---|
| | | | the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. |
| | Kansas | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | The Kansas state estimate was extrapolated from 1996 January-June state totals provided by the Kansas State UCR Program. |
| | Kentucky, Montana, New Hampshire, Vermont | The state UCR Programs were unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | The 1996 and 1997 percent changes registered for each geographic division in which the states of Kentucky, Montana, New Hampshire, and Vermont are categorized were applied to valid 1996 state totals to effect 1997 state totals. |
| 1998 | Delaware | The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with national UCR guidelines. | The 1998 forcible rape total for Delaware was estimated by reducing the number of reported offenses by the proportion of male forcible rape victims statewide. |
| | Illinois | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | Valid Crime Index (Part I) counts were available for most of the largest cities (100,000 and over in population). For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were state totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process.</p> |
| | Kansas | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | To arrive at 1998 estimates, 1997 state totals supplied by the Kansas State UCR Program were updated using 1998 crime trends for the West North Central Division. |
| | Kentucky, Montana, New Hampshire, Wisconsin | The state UCR Programs were unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | State totals were estimated by using 1997 figures for the nonreporting areas and applying 1997 versus 1998 percentage changes for the division in which each state is located. The estimates for the nonreporting areas were |

| | | | |
|------|----------------------|---|---|
| | | | then increased by any actual 1998 crime counts received. |
| 1999 | Illinois | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | Valid Crime Index (Part I) counts were available for most of the largest cities (100,000 and over in population). For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were state totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. |
| | Kansas, Kentucky, | The state UCR Programs were unable to provide complete | To arrive at 1999 estimates for Kansas, Kentucky, and Montana, |

| | | | |
|------|---------------|--|--|
| | Montana | offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | 1998 state totals supplied by each state's UCR Program were updated using 1999 crime trends for the divisions in which each state is located. |
| | Maine | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | The Maine Department of Public Safety forwarded monthly January through October crime counts for each law enforcement contributor; since 12 months of data were not received, the national Program estimated for the missing data following standard estimation procedures to arrive at a 1999 state total. |
| | New Hampshire | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete 1999 offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | The state total for New Hampshire was estimated by using the 1998 figures for the 1999 nonreporting areas and applying the 2-year percent change for the New England Division. |
| 2000 | Illinois | The state UCR Programs were unable to provide complete offense figures or forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | Valid Crime Index (Part I) counts were available for most of the largest cities (100,000 and over in population). For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were state totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the |

| | | | |
|------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | | <p>UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process.</p> |
| | Kansas | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | To arrive at 2000 estimates for Kansas, 1999 state estimates were updated using 2000 crime trends for the West North Central Division. |
| | Kentucky, Montana | The state UCR Programs were unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | To arrive at 2000 estimates for Kentucky and Montana, 1999 state totals supplied by each state's UCR Program were updated using 2000 crime trends for the divisions in which each state is located. |
| 2001 | Illinois | The state UCR Program submitted complete data for | Valid Crime Index (Part I) counts were available for most of the |

| | | | |
|------|----------|--|--|
| | | only seven agencies within the state. Additionally, the state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | largest cities (100,000 and over in population). For other agencies, the only available counts were generated without application of the UCR Hierarchy Rule. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the total supplied by the Illinois State Program (which was inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) was reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the available NIBRS data. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. |
| | Kentucky | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | To arrive at the 2001 estimate for Kentucky, the 2000 state estimates were updated using 2001 crime trends reported for the East South Central Division. |
| 2002 | Illinois | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | Valid Crime Index (Part I) counts were only available for most of the largest cities (100,000 and over in population). For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were |

| | | | |
|--|----------|--|---|
| | | | <p>state totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process.</p> |
| | Kentucky | <p>The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.</p> | <p>To obtain the 2002 state crime count, the FBI contacted the state UCR Program, and the state agency was able to provide their latest state total, 2000. Therefore, the 2001 state estimate was updated for inclusion in the 2002 edition of <i>Crime in the United States</i> by using the 2001 crime trends for the division in which the state is located. To derive the 2002 state</p> |

| | | | |
|------|----------|---|--|
| | | | estimate, the 2002 crime trends for the division were applied to the adjusted 2001 state estimate. |
| 2003 | Illinois | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | Valid Part I counts were available only for most of the largest cities (100,000 and over in population). For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were state totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's state totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process. |
| | Kentucky | The state UCR Program was | To obtain the 2003 estimate, the |

| | | | |
|------|----------|---|---|
| | | unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | 2003 crime trend for the East South Central Division was applied to an adjusted 2002 state estimate. The 2002 state count was reestimated by applying the 2002 crime trend for the East South Central Division using a more current figure, 2001 state totals, provided by the state UCR Program. The adjusted 2002 estimate differs from the figure published in the 2002 edition of <i>Crime in the United States</i> which was originally estimated using 2002 state totals. |
| 2004 | Illinois | The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | Valid Part I counts were available only for agencies in the cities 100,000 and over in population. For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be |

| | | | |
|------|----------|--|---|
| | | | <p>included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process.</p> |
| 2005 | Illinois | <p>The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.</p> | <p>Valid Part I counts were available only for agencies in the cities 100,000 and over in population. For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the</p> |

| | | | |
|------|----------|--|---|
| | | | <p>proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process.</p> |
| 2006 | Illinois | <p>The state UCR Program was unable to provide complete offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines.</p> | <p>Valid Part I counts were available only for agencies in the cities 100,000 and over in population. For other agencies, the only available counts generated by the Illinois State Program were totals based upon an incident-level system without indication of multiple offenses recorded within single incidents. Therefore, the UCR Hierarchy Rule could not be applied in order to convert the state's data to Summary format. (The Hierarchy Rule requires that only the most serious offense in a multiple-offense criminal incident is counted.) To arrive at a comparable state estimate to be included in national compilations, the Illinois State Program's totals (which were inflated because of the nonapplication of the Hierarchy Rule) were reduced by the proportion of multiple offenses reported within single incidents in the NIBRS database. Valid totals for the large cities were excluded from the reduction process.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|-----------|--|--|
| | Minnesota | The state UCR Program was unable to provide forcible rape offense figures in accordance with UCR guidelines. | To arrive at a comparable state estimate for forcible rape offenses to be included in national compilations, Minnesota's forcible rape total was estimated by using the national rates per 100,000 inhabitants within the eight population groups and proportionally assigning forcible rape volumes to Minnesota's population groups. |
|--|-----------|--|--|

Population estimation

The FBI calculated 2006 state growth rates using revised 2005 state/national population estimates and 2006 provisional state/national population estimates provided by the U.S. Census Bureau. The FBI then estimated population figures for city and county jurisdictions by applying the 2006 state growth rate to the updated 2005 U.S. Census Bureau data.

If you have questions about this table

Contact the FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services Division via e-mail at cjis_comm@leo.gov or by telephone at (304) 625-4995.